



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tions of lines are reached, and it may readily be believed that all the decorations, howsoever completely conventionalized and elementary, were referred by the potter to some living prototype.

This valuable contribution is supplemented by a second paper on "Certain Aboriginal Remains of the Tombigbee River," pages 498-516, 1 map, 5 figures.

Researches vigorously prosecuted for six weeks in mounds along this river produced meager results in the way of artifacts. The practical absence of pottery is somewhat surprising, as this art was practised almost universally in the south. Bunch burial was common, the bones of numerous individuals having been deposited together without order.

W. H. HOLMES.

Premiers essais de sculpture de l'homme préhistorique. Par ISAIË DHARVENT. Rouen: Imprimerie Julien Lecerf, 1902. 35 pp., 9 plates.

The subject of intentionally "retouched" flints and other stones from the *diluvium* has given rise in the last few years to a somewhat acrimonious discussion among archeologists and geologists, the literature of which is constantly increasing. The present well-illustrated pamphlet is a "notice and description of a collection of flints from the lower *diluvium* of northern France, intentionally retouched to make human and animal forms." The author, now a member of the Committee on Prehistoric Monuments in Pas-de-Calais, was led, in 1881, by chance reading of Boucher de Perthes' *Antiquités celtiques et antédiluviennes*, to devote himself to the task of proving the existence of these "pierres-figures" or "pierres-images" of which that master had written. At the Pas-de-Calais Archeological Exposition of 1896, M. Dharvent exhibited a collection of seventy such flints from various localities in that department, which proved of considerable interest, but failed to convince the archeologists *von Fach*. The question was brought up by M. Thieullen (the author of several papers in the French anthropological journals) at the Congress of 1900, but with little more success. In the case of M. Dharvent there has occurred no such deception on the part of laborers or assistants as is said to have discredited some of Boucher de Perthes' data, so the matter is one of "retouching" or not. The same question was raised at the Congress of 1866 by M. Chatel, who then failed to convince the scholars of the day. Of French archeologists, the following, among others, have refused to recognize the "retouched flints" of MM. Dharvent and Thieullen as anything more than *lusi naturæ*, simple accidents, effects due to cold, heat, frost, etc.:

Adrien de Mortillet, Salomon Reinach, A. de Marsy, M. Boule, and M. Capitan. Professor Montelius and Sir John Evans have also expressed themselves as unconvinced. The Abbé Breuil and M. Gosselet seem more favorably disposed. If anything could convince one it would be the beautiful figures of the plates accompanying this essay, but, as the "forms" which the mind's eye makes of ink-spots warn us, we cannot doubt but that here also the imagination plays its wonted rôle. The figures of monkey-profiles, human faces and skulls, heads of monkeys, sheep, dogs, squirrels, deer, boars, frogs, etc., are easy to see because M. Dharvent tells us where to look for them,— they are like some "puzzle-pictures," which, once seen, are hard to get out of the mind. M. Dharvent admits that he has no better arguments to support his position than had Boucher de Perthes, but considers such ocular evidence as that presented by the simian profile of plate IX to be incontrovertible.

The theory of "pierres à retouches" has also developed in England. In two letters to the *London Times* (Sept. 3, 7, 1901), the Hon. Auberon Herbert writes of his discovery, in the gravel beds of the Avon valley in South Hampshire, of a mass of worked stones, the greater number of which "are representations of the tokens of the tribes,"— suns, moons, animals, birds, fishes, mountains, parts of the human body, etc. Here we have, if we believe the Honorable Herbert, "a new volume of *Totemism* suddenly placed in our hands." In *Man* (London, 1901, 149-151), Prof. A. C. Haddon rightly observes that "whatever the stones may be, they can never be proved to be totems or representations of totems." There is the strongest reason for refusing even to believe them artifacts. It is worth recalling that Boucher de Perthes (and Chatel after him) found "symbolic signs" and a "hieroglyphic language" of antediluvian man in the shapes of men and animals he saw in the stones of the river-drift. So the theory of "totemism" is hardly new. The reviewer cannot escape the conclusion that, on evidence now in hand, the "retouched stones" represent an interesting chapter in "the scientific uses of the imagination." The mind of twentieth century man, not the hand of prehistoric man's precursor, has done this.

ALEXANDER F. CHAMBERLAIN.

The Huntington California Expedition. Maidu Myths. By ROLAND B. DIXON. (Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. XVII, part II, pp. 33-118.) New York: June 30, 1902.

Lying between the cultural area of the Northwest coast and that of the Pueblos, flanked on the east by the widespread Shoshoni tribes